



Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Commissioner for Patents", P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On September 7, 2005Signature *Renée D. East*Typed or  
Printed name Renée D. EastDocket Number: 1688(15723)Application No.: 10/003,816Filed: 10/25/2001First Named Inventor: Benjamin J. Parker et al.Art Unit: 2136Examiner: Firas B. Alomari

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.

*Mark L. Mollon*  
Signature

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.  
(Form PTO/SB/96)

Mark L. Mollon  
Typed or printed name

☒ attorney or agent of record.Registration Number 31,123

734-542-0900  
Telephone number

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34(a).

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34(a). \_\_\_\_\_

September 7, 2005  
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below\*.

☐ \*Total of \_\_\_\_\_ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, U. S. Department of Commerce, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-8--PTO-9199 and select option 2.



PATENT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify that this document is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date set forth below.

  
Renee D. East

Date of signature and deposit - September 7, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Benjamin J. Parker et al	)	Group Art Unit: 2136
	)	
Serial No.: 10/003,816	)	Confirmation No.: 4720
	)	
Filed: 10/25/2001	)	Examiner: Firas B. Alomari
	)	
For: Network Security Services Architecture	)	Attorney Docket: 1688(15723)

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REMARKS ACCOMPANYING REQUEST FOR  
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF CONFERENCE

Honorable Sir:

Pursuant to the procedure specified in the Notice published in the Official Gazette on July 12, 2005, review is requested for the following reasons.

The final rejection contains clear errors in that claimed limitations are clearly not met by the cited references.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 20 stand rejected as being anticipated by Wadlow. As explained on pages 7 and 8 of the amendment filed April 1, 2005, Wadlow fails to disclose security service pathways wherein each pathway provides a respective combination of security service features. In the present invention, a service selection gateway directs user traffic to a respective one of the security service pathways or to a pass-through router depending upon a subscriber configuration. As described at page 5 in the specification, security service features may include firewall protection, content

filtering, virus scanning, or a combination of them simultaneously. By providing these features as a network service, the users are relieved of the burden of selecting, installing, configuring, and maintaining software for performing these functions. By providing separate security service pathways with different combinations of security features, the claimed network architecture facilitates the provisioning of these features in a highly efficient manner so that the features can be provided to the user at a lower cost.

On page 13 of the final rejection mailed July 26, 2005, it is argued that “Claim 1 in Wadlow’s [sic] is more specific as it disclose [sic] a plurality of communication paths between components of the plurality of packet processing components (networking devices) configurable policy enforcement means...” Each path of the plurality of communication paths taught by Wadlow runs between two respective processing components (i.e., a path described in Wadlow is a communication link), as opposed to a recited pathway of the present invention which provides a respective combination of security service features. The present invention accords the desired combination of security features to traffic associated with a particular user merely by directing the traffic to a particular pathway. Once in the pathway, the traffic necessarily receives the desired security treatment. The security devices in a particular pathway carry only the traffic directed through that pathway, and the traffic directed to a pathway passes through all devices in the pathway. In other words, a firewall in one pathway receives only traffic that has the specific combination of security features that includes the specific level of firewall protection given by that firewall. In Wadlow, there are no dedicated paths and any particular traffic must be specifically directed to each of the components desired.

On pages 13 and 14 of the final rejection mailed July 26, 2005, it is argued that Figures 7-17 of Wadlow show “different examples of paths for traffic [wherein] each path is corresponding to a different security policy.” However, the selective routing of traffic among different components (where a particular component may be part of many different routes) fails to either teach or suggest the architecture of pathways as claimed in the present application.

As explained on page 8 of the amendment filed April 1, 2005, the rejection relies on the external router (ER) of Wadlow to allegedly show both the pass-through router and the security service router of claim 1. However, these two routers in claim 1 handle distinctly different user traffic independently of one another. Therefore, it is erroneous to suggest that each one is taught by a single component of Wadlow. It is a misreading of the workings of Wadlow to suggest that this one component performs the functions of the pass-through router and security service router of claim 1.

Claims 14 and 16-19 stand rejected as being anticipated by Barrett. As explained on page 9 of the amendment filed April 1, 2005, Barrett fails to disclose either a plurality of security service pathways or the re-directing of user traffic to a particular security service pathway of a plurality of security service pathways wherein the particular security service pathway corresponds to security service features identified by a user profile. Moreover, Barrett lacks a separate pass-through router and has no teaching of re-directing user traffic to the pass-through router if the user profile has no security service features. The comments on pages 15 and 16 of the final rejection mailed July 26, 2005, likewise fail to address the pathway architecture recited in the claims.

In view of the foregoing reasons, claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark L. Mollon  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 31,123

Dated: September 7, 2005  
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC  
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor  
720 Water Street  
Toledo, Ohio 43604  
(734) 542-0900  
(734) 542-9569 (fax)